



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,050	08/30/2001	Genaro Antonio Fernandez Orozco	10008276-1	8477

7590 07/05/2002
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
SEVER, ANDREW T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2851	

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/943,050

Applicant(s)

OROZCO, GENARO ANTONIO
FERNANDEZ

Examiner

Andrew T Sever

Art Unit

2851

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 August 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: 209. A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 12-15, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hinman et al. (US 5,940,049).

Hinman et al. teaches in figure 2 a system for providing an overhead image (49), comprising a scan region that receives a document (13) containing data to be projected; an illumination element that illuminates (17) the document to produce image light; means for capturing and digitizing the image light as digital information a camera or CCD (15), as is claimed by applicant's claim 15; and a video subsystem that produces a projection image (lamp 29, LCD 39, projection lens 48) from the digital information. Hinman teaches a CPU (21) for processing the digital information before receipt by the video subsystem as is claimed in applicant's claim 2. Hinman teaches in column 2 lines 21-45

Art Unit: 2851

that the system includes digital means for substantially enhancing the readability of the digital image as is claimed in applicant's claims 8 and 14.

Hinman further teaches in Figure 6 a flow chart for operating the system. The image inputted (112) by the camera (15) is processed by an application program ran in the CPU. The application program allows the user to modify the image through a keyboard input and/or via a stylus & digitizer input. Hinman teaches that the image can be displayed and/or printed by a printer (132), which inherently prints a printable file produced by the CPU as is claimed in applicant's claims 6, 12, and 19. The image can also be transmitted via a modem or network to other computers and inherently the image would be transmitted as an electronic file of the digital information, which could inherently be stored as is claimed in applicant's claims 7, 13, and 20.

The system taught by Hinman makes it inherent that a method for using it (as is claimed in applicants' claims 8, 12, 13) exists and Hinman also claims the methods in his claims 13-18.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 3-5, 9-11, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinman et al. (US 5,940,049) as applied to claim 1, 2, 6-8, 12-15, 19, and 20.

Hinman et al. as described in more detail above, teaches a system for providing an overhead image, which digitally scans the image, processes it in a CPU, and then projects it via a video subsystem. The system includes an application program and keyboard input to allow the user to modify the projected image. However Hinman et al. does not necessarily specifically teach that the CPU is operable to modify a color range of the digital information, and/or able to increase contrast, and/or perform edge enhancement of the digital information. Further Hinman also teaches the method of using it as is claimed in applicant's claims 9-11.

Hinman does teach in column 2 lines 21-46 that the system is provided with means for modifying the image such as filtering the image to correct for lens aberrations and presumably other errors, so that the projected images are much improved in both resolution and readability with respect to the ambient illumination environment. Presumably this would have included the ability to change the color range, increase contrast, and/or perform edge enhancements. Further all three of these characteristics were commonly modified by graphics related application software. One with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have recognized that well known scanners at the time such as those that were found in modern copiers had the ability for the user to change the color range, increase the contrast, and/or perform edge enhancements. Further that same person with ordinary skill would also have known that digital image editing software made by Adobe and other companies, which could presumably be the application software, also had the ability to perform these changes. Given the high prevalence of application software in the projection and scanning arts that

Art Unit: 2851

allowed a user to modify and change the color range, increase contrast, and/or perform edge enhancements at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include in the application software of Hinman et al. interactive projector the ability for the CPU to modify a color range (as is claimed in applicant's claims 3 and 9), increase contrast (as is claimed in applicant's claims 4, 10, and 17), and perform edge enhancements (as is claimed in applicant's claims 5, 11, and 18) of a scanned in digital image, so that a substantially improved image is projected.

With regards to applicant's claim 16 it was also common for application software as well as projector hardware to have the ability to change a color digital image into a monochrome one, presumably removing all colors and replacing them with a gray scale, this was frequently useful where the display environment was bright, or where color information was confusing or obscured the desired image. Therefore it would have also been obvious for one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the ability in Hinman's system to remove the colors.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew T Sever whose telephone number is 703-305-4036. The examiner can normally be reached M-F 7:30-4:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Russell Adams can be reached at 703-308-2847. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 2851

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3431 for regular communications and 703-308-7382 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

AS
June 28, 2002


RUSSELL ADAMS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800